	Page 1		
1	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT		
2	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK		
3	Case No. 18-23538-shl		
4	Adv. Case No. 20-06982-shl		
5	x		
6	In the Matter of:		
7			
8	SEARS HOLDINGS CORPORATION,		
9			
10	Debtor.		
11	x		
12	KMART HOLDING CORPORATION, et al.,		
13	Plaintiffs,		
14	v.		
15	WINIADAEWOO ELECTRONICS AMERICA INC.,		
16	Defendant.		
17	x		
18			
19	United States Bankruptcy Court		
20	300 Quarropas Street, Room 248		
21	White Plains, NY 10601		
22			
23	December 21, 2022		
24	2:17 pm		
25			

Page 3 1 HEARING re Omnibus Hearing 2 3 HEARING re Doc. #10738 Application For Final Professional Compensation Of Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP, As Attorneys For 4 Debtors Period: 7/1/2022 To 10/31/2022, 5 Fee:\$1,134,520.00, Expenses: \$3,802.26 6 7 8 HEARING re Doc. #10532 Application For Interim Professional 9 Compensation / Twelfth Quarterly Report Of Katten Muchin 10 Rosenman LLP, As Special Avoidance Counsel For The Debtors, 11 For Allowance Of Contingent Fees And Reimbursement Of 12 Expenses For The Period From April 1, 2022 Through june 30, 13 2022 14 15 HEARING re Doc. #10533 Application For Interim Professional 16 Compensation / Twelfth Quarterly Report Of Stretto For 17 Allowance Of Contingent Fees And Reimbursement Of Expenses For The Period From April 1, 2022 Through June 30, 2022 18 19 20 HEARING re Doc. #10735 Application For Final Decree / 21 Liquidating Trustee's Motion For Entry of (I) Final Decree 22 Closing Certain Of The Chapter 11 Cases And (IT) Granting 23 Related Relief 24 25

Page 4 1 HEARING re Adversary proceeding: 20-06982-shl Kmart Holding 2 Corporation et al v. Winiadaewoo Electronics America Inc. Doc. #36 Motion To Compel / Motion Of Plaintiffs For Order 3 (I) Enforcing Procedures Order Governing Preference 4 5 Adversary Proceedings With Amounts In Controversy In 6 Excess Of \$500,000 And (II) Granting Related Relief 7 8 HEARING re Adversary proceeding: 20-06982-shl Kmart Holding 9 Corporation et al v. Winiadaewoo Electronics America Inc. 10 Doc. #41 Objection To Motion To Enforce Procedures Order 11 12 HEARING re Adversary proceeding: 20-06982-shl Kmart Holding 13 Corporation et al v. Winiadaewoo Electronics America Inc. 14 Doc. #42 Reply In Support Of Motion Of Plaintiffs For Order 15 (1) Enforcing Procedures Order Governing Preference 16 Adversary Proceedings With Amounts In Controversy In 17 Excess Of \$500,000 And (II) Granting Related Relief 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 Transcribed by: Sonya Ledanski Hyde

1	1 g 3 01 23
	Page 5
1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP
4	Attorneys for the Bidding Trustee
5	767 Fifth Avenue
6	New York, NY 10153
7	
8	BY: GARRETT FAIL
9	
10	KATTEN, MUCHIN, ROSENMAN LLP
11	Attorneys for the Debtor
12	525 West Monroe Street
13	Chicago, IL 60661
14	
15	BY: TERENCE G. BANICH
16	STEVEN J. REISMAN
17	MICHAEL ROSELLA
18	
19	LAW OFFICES OF PERRY R. CLARK
20	Attorneys for Winia Electronics America, Inc.
21	825 San Antonio Road, Suite 201
22	Palo Alto, CA 94303
23	
24	BY: PERRY R. CLARK
25	

Page 6 ALSO PRESENT TELEPHONICALLY: ROBERT A. BRADBURY GAITANA JARAMILLO WILLIAM MURPHY ERIKA L. MORABITO ANNE J. PENACHIO GARY POLKOWITZ PAUL KENAN SCHWARTZBERG

Pg 7 of 29

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: Good afternoon. This is Judge Sean Lane in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York and we're here for a 2:00 hearing in the Sears Holding Corporation Chapter 11 case. So, we'll start with appearances. Let me find out whose here on behalf of the Debtor.

MR. FAIL: Hi. Good afternoon, Judge. Garrett Fail, Weil, Gotshal and Manges on behalf of the bidding Trustee. Good afternoon.

THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon. understand that one of the matters we have on deals with the adversary proceeding and so let me find out who's here on behalf of the Plaintiff in that adversary proceeding.

MR. BANICH: Yes, Your Honor. This is Terence Banich from Katten, Muchin, Rosenman in Chicago on behalf of the Plaintiffs.

THE COURT: Good afternoon. And on behalf of the Defendant in that proceeding?

MR. CLARK: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Perry Clark. I represent the Defendant, WINIA Electronics America, Inc.

THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon. And let me get any other appearances for today's proceeding.

MR. ROSENMAN: Your Honor, Steven Reisman of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 7

Pg 8 of 29 Page 8 1 Katten Muchin Rosenman. I'm here with respect to the Katten 2 and Stretto fee applications that are on -- or fee 3 application court -- fee app that's on for today. And I'm 4 joined by my partners Mr. Banich and my associates are 5 Michael Rosella. I've promoted him a little too early. 6 THE COURT: All right. That's -- I'm sure that's 7 not a problem from Mr. Rosella's point of view. Now, any 8 other appearances? 9 MR. ROSELLA: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Michael 10 Rosella from Katten Muchin Rosenman, (indiscernible) person 11 just mentioned. 12 THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon to you. 13 All right. So, with that, I will turn it over to Mr. Fail 14 to start us off. 15 MR. FAIL: Thanks, Judge. We filed an agenda at 16 Docket Number 10764, and I'll just run through the 17 uncontested matters in that order. The first out -- the 18 first item is a final application of Weil, Gotshal & Manges 19 for fees and expenses incurred from July 1 through October 20 31, 2022, a couple days after the plan went effective and 21 the last day that these would be subject to court approval 22 in these cases. 23 Your Honor will recall after taking over these

cases that the Debtors were successful in negotiating a

settlement and resolution of pending litigation.

24

25

The funds

came in and the work done in this period included work to effectuate the effective date of the Chapter 11 plan for the Debtors in these cases. And you'll see later on, on the agenda, is the Liquidating Trustee's motion to close out certain of the cases to help clear the Court's dockets of matters that no longer need to (indiscernible).

THE COURT: All right. That all -- I appreciate the recap. And so, I did see that there was a certificate of no objection filed as to the Katten Muchin application.

I didn't see -- I didn't see such thing for the Weil application, but I didn't see any objection. So, any -- anything else that I wanted to address as to the uncontested fee matters?

MR. FAIL: No, Your Honor. I'd be happy to answer any questions. But otherwise, we'd request that the Weil, the Katten, and the Stretto matters be approved.

THE COURT: All right. Anybody wish to be heard in connection with these three fee matters? All right. Let the record reflect there is no one chiming in and also reflect that there, in fact, was no objections of any of these fee applications. I'm happy to grant them all. I find that the applications here are appropriate given the facts and circumstances of the case and applicable law. And I'm happy to approve them. And so, I will so order the record. You'll get the appropriate orders. But this order

into the record allows things to move forward while those written orders are pending.

 $\label{eq:AndSoN} \mbox{And so, with that, Mr. Fail, I guess we can move} \\ \mbox{on to II.}$

MR. FAIL: Thank you, Judge. II is the
Liquidating Trustee's Motion to close the cases of 52 what
we're referring to as subsidiary debtor cases. The Chapter
11 plan was effective -- became effective. The plan was
substantially consummated. All of the factors weigh in
favor of closing these Chapter 11 dockets, the cases were to
remind you, Your Honor, substantially -- consolidated for
procedural purposes at the beginning of the case. That one
main docket will remain docket will remain open so if the
other Debtors need to access the Court for any remaining
matters subsequent any reconciliation that might come before
you. And this does not affect any adversary proceedings
that will remain open (indiscernible) on the main case.

So, to cut down on U.S. Trustee fees, administrative burdens, and to clear out your docket, we would request that this motion be granted as well.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much.

Anybody wish to be heard in connection with Liquidating

Trustee's motion for a final decree closing certain of these

Chapter 11 cases?

MR. FAIL: Judge, I just want -- I'd just note we

Page 11 did file a certificate of no objection and it was a redline of a proposed order attached. Your Honor may recall in these cases, as part of the confirmation years ago, an administrative claims representative was appointed to assist and represent those creditors that were not paid in full during the cases, during the course of (indiscernible) served in that capacity. And we had in clarifying language to this order that we cleared, I think, responsibilities and duties were discharged on a go-forward basis. And better synced for service and just wanted to just point that out to

THE COURT: All right. That makes -- that makes And I assume that you didn't hear from the U.S. Trustee's Office in connection with this particular motion. I ask because they oftentimes weigh in on these kinds of motions.

MR. FAIL: I see Mr. Schwartzberg's box on the screen, but we received no comments and no objections.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Schwartzberg, do you have anything to add?

MR. SCHWARTZBERG: I have nothing, Your Honor. Paul Schwartzberg for the U.S. Trustee's Office. I have no objection.

THE COURT: All right. All right. I'm happy to grant this motion at ECF Number 10735. It is a not uncommon

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Your Honor.

kind of motion in a case involving this many different debtor cases to streamline at a certain point the debtors that need to remain in bankruptcy from those that don't, and thus, reduce some of the cost of being in bankruptcy, which is always a good idea. So, I'm happy to grant this motion and just to make sure we have a proposed order. Obviously, there's a redline version of that and I'll use that version.

So, that motion is granted. Next up.

MR. FAIL: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: So, we now segue to III, the adversary proceeding, which deals with the motion to enforce procedures dealing with arbitration. I've seen the motion.

I've seen the opposition. I've seen the reply. And I confess, I spent some time debating what to do in a context of this. And so, in order to save a little bit of time and not set anybody up for -- to -- for a more heated colloquy, I just thought I would tell you where I am on this. And then you can argue whatever you'd like argue, and I'll hear from everybody. But I've been in your shoes in a former life. I always wanted to know what the judge was thinking if the judge had something in mind ahead of time, so I think it's only fair -- and in the spirit of the holidays, to do that.

administrative expenses down. And so, it's a fairly easy act by this Court to find cause to the extent that there was issues in timing in this case that didn't allow that process happen to let it happen now. There's clearly a lot of bad blood between these parties and I am aware of the discovery disputes that were on in front of Judge Drain as a reflection of that.

opportunities here. I understand the response of the Defendant, which is so technically, this is how you could have done it and this, that, and the other thing. But I also understand that when people are getting along in cases, that's kind of how it's supposed to be. And there are lots of times when judge -- people say, we don't want to bring this to the judge. This is not the kind of thing we want to bring to the judge. It's a common discussion in the U.S. Attorney's Office (indiscernible) cases. Do we bring this to the judge? And the answer's, like, well, what's the reason to do that. Because the judge will assume that we're responsible adults and we can work out most of our problems. And that is true.

I will say that you always have to be careful when there are court ordered deadlines. At a certain point, you lose the ability to not bother me and that's fine. That's an occupational hazard on my part in taking this job. So, I

can never really blame somebody if you say, well, I had an emergency hearing that was requested on Friday that I had earlier today because somebody said, Judge, I have this problem. And I'm just -- I'm in a box and I need relief before Christmas. And I understand and that's part of the gig.

So, and perhaps it may have been, given the party's relationship, the better course to come and ask me for some sort of relief or modification of the order. But I understand people were trying to get along. And I'm not going to hold people trying to get along against them.

That's how the system's supposed to work.

So, my inclination is -- well, I don't have a magic equity wand that I always tell people doesn't exist in bankruptcy. I do have an ability and discretion for good cause shown to amend an order like this and to do that because if that's what the order said, the case was supposed to be mediated, that's what the order said.

And if, because of the way the case unfolded, timing became problematic and then things descended into disagreement, that's a problem I actually can fix with the waive of then pen and just amend the order to say mediation has not taken place there -- for lots of reasons, discovery, this, that, and the other thing, and then things fell apart and to just reset the deadline for that. And sadly, I

understand it means that if people can't agree on things going forward, then they'll be back in front of me. And I'm certainly happy to make amendments to the regular procedures to account for the fact that people aren't getting along.

And if that means that you can't choose a mediator. Well, everybody can, you know, pick three names that they agree upon, submit them, and I'll pick one. Or if you can't even do that, you can each submit two and then I'll pick one from the four. And you don't even tell me who identified who and I'll just pick blind. But hopefully, it won't come to that because that's probably not the result. But I understand, I'm the option of last resort and the blunt instrument to deal with those kinds of things and that's fine.

So, I mention all this in the spirit of the holidays so we can avoid unnecessary acrimony and a detailing of a past history that probably all counsel would agree on one thing that they could probably live without reliving, again, this afternoon.

And so, I'm certainly happy to hear from anybody. If somebody wants to take a run at me to change my mind, that's fine. But that's sort of where I am. And I don't want to yell at anybody, and I don't want to start second-guessing all of you and getting into this -- these kinds of things. In a way, it's sort of any extension of discovery

disputes, there's almost nothing better than discovery dispute other than to say a fight about attorney's fee in bankruptcy.

So, I've already had a couple of those this week, so I'm trying to end on a positive holiday note. And so -- so, that's where I am. And so, so I'll hear first from the Plaintiff. If -- I'm not going to award anybody any fees, so -- because the spirit of things sort of sides with the Plaintiffs. The technical aspects of complying with the order side with the Defendants. But again, putting the forest and the trees in context, the whole point of the order is to have a mediation. That's what should happen, so let's do that and I'll set dates for that to happen.

And so, with that, let me hear from the Plaintiff if there's anything you wanted -- you either want to convince me otherwise or anything you wanted to add, or a specific request that you had as to some relief to help things go more smoothly going forward.

MR. BANICH: Good afternoon, Judge. It's Terence Banich for the Plaintiffs. And I wanted to start by thanking Your Honor for those very helpful remarks, and particularly they'll spark the spirit of the procedures order and of the holidays, for that matter. Before I get into anything, I wanted to just clarify one thing. And that's that while there have been some discovery disputes

with the Defendant in the past history of this adversary,
Mr. Clark, who represents the Defendant, we have gotten
along quite well.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. BANICH: And I think Mr. Clark is a very able advocate. And we have not had the sort of, you know, spats that lawyers don't get along have. We -- it hasn't been like that at all. There just has been some, perhaps difficulty in communicating on some matters, maybe some, you know, genuine disagreements about what our burdens were in discovery. And it kind of snowballed into some other things.

THE COURT: All right. That can happen.

MR. BANICH: So, you know, we don't --

THE COURT: That can happen.

MR. BANICH: Yeah.

THE COURT: Again, I bore people with this story.

Sometimes I have a box in my office of various mementos from my days in practice, partially to remind myself of the difficulty of being in practice. Right? It's not easy and when you're advocating on behalf of your client. And it could be a challenge. So, I'm happy to be able to try to let all of us move forward in a productive and peaceful way. And I'm happy to hear that you and Mr. Clark are getting along. That solves a lot of problems, and so thank you for

sharing that.

MR. BANICH: Of course. So, in terms of the relief, I hear -- heard your analysis, Judge, and we agree that the spirit of the procedures order, you know, requires among other things there to be a mediation or an attempt at it in good faith. We have been -- stood ready to do that since our first communication with Mr. Clark on the subject in October of 2021. We stand ready to do so today. And however, whatever procedural path Your Honor wishes to take to get to that result, we're obviously only too happy to agree to it.

Now, we haven't had the chance to discuss potential dates with Mr. Clark. So, I heard Your Honor say that you were going to set a date. But I --

THE COURT: Yeah, my thought would be that it's something that should happen in the next three months. That sounds about right given where you are, that you've done all the other work. And if you can't agree on a mediator, then you can just suggest some names and not identify who suggested who. And I'll pick one. And you can take some solace in the fact that I was on a panel dealing with mediation in bankruptcy court. And I was on it with an academic, which is good because they have a different perspective about these things. And a number of judges in the audience said, well, I don't require it when people

Page 19 1 don't want to do it because I just find it's not worth it. 2 And she, well, yeah, I can see that point of view, but 3 studies show that the success in mediation does not, in 4 fact, vary with whether people want to go to mediate or not, 5 which was actually a surprise to me. 6 So -- and so, I think that's just something that -7 - to the extent that people have, anybody has any reluctance about mediation, you can share that tidbit or not with not 8 9 your client if it helps to smooth the waters. 10 So, does a three-month deadline for having a 11 mediation have sense? 12 MR. BANICH: To me, Your Honor, I think that's 13 perfectly acceptable. Thank you. 14 THE COURT: All right. Anything else, counsel, 15 before I hear from the other side. 16 MR. BANICH: No. No, Your Honor. Thank you for 17 the time. 18 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Mr. Clark, 19 anything that you wanted to share? 20 MR. CLARK: Thank you, Your Honor. So, this will 21 -- this -- you setting of the deadline to complete the issue 22 will also operate to reset the other deadlines in the 23 procedures order. 24 THE COURT: No.

The deadlines for the other --

MR. CLARK:

THE COURT: No, it won't. That's a separate thing. If there's discover and people are fighting about discovery deadlines and cutoffs, you can try to work it out. And if you can't -- and if you can't work it out, I'm very likely to go along. If you can't -- if you can't work it out, then people -- we'll do the time-honored tradition of submitting letters and then we'll have a conference.

Frankly, I will say -- and sometimes I regret making this offer. But I usually find that if a conference on discovery can avoid lengthy letter-writing campaigns, I always encourage to people to instead of writing the nastygrams that sort of happen in discovery disputes to just say,

Judge, we need a conference. The vast majority of discovery disputes can be talked through during a conference.

And I always have those conferences with the understanding that everybody reserves their rights if there's a substantive legal issue that needs briefing, then you can say, Judge, we actually should brief this. And so, there are times when there's complicated privilege issues or things of that sort, so nobody will ever give up their right to legally brief something like that. But frankly, we all know most discovery disputes are not about that, they're about other things. And as somebody who was a litigator before taking this job and with 12-odd years on the bench, I -- you know, we can handle most discovery disputes by phone.

So, my thought would be just make sure to talk to each other ahead of time. If you have a discovery dispute you can call chambers. I try to schedule those, you know, within a day or two of getting the request. And so, I'm not trying to reset other deadlines. Frankly, the mediation, it doesn't really necessarily track other deadlines. And so, I understand there was a need -- there was a request for documents, which is you know, I guess part and parcel for understanding the other side's position. And that's fine. It sounds like you sorted through that.

But I'll request that you have a conference. And

But I'll request that you have a conference. And if you have a discovery issue, then just reach out to chambers. A one line, one sentence letter saying, Judge, we need a discovery conference, would suffice.

MR. CLARK: Yeah, no, I -- thank you, Your Honor.

And I do appreciate your collaborative approach. Certainly,

not all judges are like that. Only concern is that --

THE COURT: You can tell me whether it's wise or not, but we try.

MR. CLARK: No, I understand. I wouldn't -- yeah,
I understand. My only concerning is telegraphing that, you
know, for example, there's a fact discovery put on. It was
set to -- it's key to the conclusion of mediation. And
there's an expert report, you know, deadline and an
expert -- in fact, a position deadline that's key to the

completion of the engagement --

THE COURT: Okay. I think I get your drift. So, if they're separate and independent and they are what they are, that's fine. If you're -- if you have deadlines coming up that would be delayed because you say, we'll do the mediation first. That makes perfect sense to me. So, you know, what I'd say, work it out with the other side and say we want to rejigger the upcoming deadlines in light of the -- that we're going to take a hiatus -- essentially, a hiatus for a mediation, that's fine, completely makes sense to me.

MR. CLARK: Okay. So, those deadlines would just be extended commiserate with whether -- whether it would or --

THE COURT: Yeah, I mean, the idea behind mediation also is to save some money. We all know most civil disputes settle and the question is sort of when they resolve themselves. Each case is different, but the idea, hopefully, is to -- is to be able to save a little bit of money in the process. But that's fine. So, what I would say is the -- you could -- what I always like to do though in each case is have a scheduling order, so we all know where we are. And so, it -- with this sort of reopening of mediation, if you want to work together on some deadlines consistent with that, and you agree, submit it to me, and

I'm happy to so order it. We'll put it on the docket and that way everybody has something. Because I find life without a scheduling order is not a good place to be. So, it protects everybody.

So -- but again, it can be as formal or informal as you want. It can be, you know, a revised proposed scheduling order. It can be a letter saying you all agree these are the deadlines. And certainly, each case is different in terms of how much detail you have about specific discovery events such as provision of expert reports and things of that sort. But I'm happy to follow your lead on that.

I don't remember what the discovery -- what the order -- any scheduling order here, which obviously predates me, and I didn't preside over what those look like and how much detail's in there. But some cases, more detail's better than others. So -- but I'll be guided by your thinking on that -- your collective thinking.

MR. CLARK: Yeah. Just with the understanding that we are going to redo the scheduling order that we already have, we'll try to reach an agreement on redoing that.

THE COURT: All right. All right. Anything else,
Mr. Clark?

MR. CLARK: No, Your Honor.

Page 24 1 THE COURT: All right. 2 MR. BANICH: Your Honor, I just have one 3 procedural --THE COURT: 4 Sure. 5 MR. BANICH: -- point to bring up before we move 6 In terms of selecting the mediator, I'd just wish to point out that the procedures order that we've been talking 7 about does require that the parties select a mediator from 8 9 one of six people listed on Exhibit 3 to the procedures 10 order. So, there's like a closed universe, technically, of 11 these --THE COURT: That's fine. I --12 13 MR. BANICH: -- potential mediators? 14 THE COURT: -- I'm, yeah, I'm not trying to over -15 - I'm not trying to, other than reopen the ability to do 16 this, I'm not trying to substantively amend the procedures 17 order. That's fine. Thank you for that reminder. I was 18 just speaking about mediation generally, the mediation drill 19 that we have --20 MR. BANICH: Yes, sir. 21 THE COURT: -- but that's fine. So, whatever the 22 procedures orders say on that is fine. And obviously, to 23 the extent that you all reach agreement about things -- I'm 24 always happy to entertain that, but -- but yeah. So, choose 25 a mediator and just get me -- get me something.

1 it's a letter that has scheduling or a proposed revised scheduling order, whatever you think is easiest and most cost-effective, and I'll enter that. And I will consider 3 today to be essentially an oral application as the deadlines 4 5 are going to change given that you're going to go ahead with 6 mediation. And I understand that so people cannot worry 7 about that. If -- so, if there's a deadline, it's going to 8 get blown in a month, you don't have to worry about that 9 because I understand. You clued me in, so thank you. 10 Anything else from anyone? 11 MR. BANICH: No, sir. Thank you very much. 12 THE COURT: All right. 13 MR. CLARK: Nope, thanks Your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you very much. I appreciate and 15 I hope I've made things easier rather than more difficult. 16 But I guess time will tell. But if you need anything, 17 you'll let me know. Otherwise, I'll wait for a revised 18 scheduling order, and we'll take it from there. And with that, Mr. Fail, is there anything else on 19 20 the agenda for today? 21 MR. FAIL: Just again, thank you. Happy Holiday 22 and Happy New Year to you and chambers. 23 THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. Happy Holidays to you all, you, and your families, and stay 24 25 healthy. We hope -- and I'll mention this to counsel here

2

because I don't know if I've said this to any of you. We hope to be coming back in person. Certainly, my hope if the COVID numbers cooperate that we would have -- we'll be able to do that sometime, you know, say February or March, something like that. We'll all have to see because COVID has had a lot of surprises for all of us. And the idea would be better than all these circumstances, we default to in-person, but we'd always have a virtual option available for anybody who has any particular health concerns. We obviously don't want anyone to be in a bad by virtue of just having to show up in court.

So, that's the hope. But I'll keep everybody informed. And if anybody has any suggestions about that kind of stuff going forward, I always welcome informal comments. And I think I'm not alone, I think that's true for all my colleagues. So, feel free to reach out to me or our clerk of court or deputy clerk report if you have any ideas. We're trying to make this work the best for our customers, for folks who appear in front of us consistent with health and safety needs.

So, that's why I just figured I'd just clue you in where I -- I'm hoping to head. Knock wood, and we'll see -- we'll see how it goes. But in the meantime, happy holidays, and be well.

MR. BANICH: Thank you, Judge.

	Pg 28 of 29		
		Page 28	
1	INDEX		
2			
3	RULINGS		
4		Page Li	ne
5	Docket #10764 Granted	9 21	
6	Docket #10735 Granted	11 25	
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

Page 29 1 CERTIFICATION 2 3 I, Sonya Ledanski Hyde, certified that the foregoing 4 transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. 5 Songa M. deslarshi Hyel 6 7 8 Sonya Ledanski Hyde 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 Veritext Legal Solutions 21 330 Old Country Road 22 Suite 300 Mineola, NY 11501 23 24 25 Date: December 27, 2022